

CHRISTIANITY and *CRISIS*

A BI-WEEKLY JOURNAL OF CHRISTIAN OPINION

Volume 1, No. 5.

April 7, 1941

\$1.50 per year; 10 cents per copy

A Negotiated Peace

CERTAIN sections in the Protestant Church persist in their belief that there is something uniquely "Christian" in the advocacy of a negotiated peace. This idea was first advanced at the very beginning of the war and has been given periodic impetus by various groups since that time. If we are informed correctly, we may expect a new campaign along this line shortly.

This stubborn belief, held by men whose sincerity cannot be doubted, is a perfect revelation of the lack of political realism in American Protestantism. Hitler bestrides the continent of Europe and nothing stands between him and the complete victory, which he undoubtedly regards as within his grasp, but the stubborn resistance of the British and the increasing aid of America. Naturally Hitler has visions of the possibility of a complete triumph. His success against British shipping has been so great of late that he may not even attempt the hazardous adventure of invasion. This is not to say that Hitler will be victorious. The point is that he still has good reason to hope for victory and therefore no incentive at all to make a peace which would conform to even minimal standards of justice. The only possible peace which Hitler would accept now would be one which left an unredeemed continent under the heel of his dictatorship and which would give him the possibility of a more complete triumph later.

To insist that it is the religious duty of Christians to advocate a negotiated peace under these circumstances means that Christian "idealism" has been compounded with one of two possible errors:

(1) It may mean that the Christian idealist considers any kind of peace, without regard to the quality of its justice, as morally preferable to the continuance of the war. Although there are few Christian idealists who will admit that they actually prefer a tyrannical peace to continued resistance, it is a fact, nevertheless, that many are driven to this unwilling conclusion. Since they begin all their reasoning on the question of war with the premise that nothing can be worse than war, they can hardly escape the

conclusion that the enslavement of Europe is to be preferred to the continued resistance of Britain.

(2) Most isolationists and political pacifists seek to escape the necessity of arriving at such a conclusion by holding out the hope that if only someone, the President or the Pope or some other leader, would be willing to call a conference, the matter in dispute between the nations could be arbitrated or mediated and a just peace might be achieved. Sometimes this hope is supported by the belief that such a conference would be able to appeal over the head of Hitler to the German people and prompt them to force Hitler to yield. This belief obviously does not take into consideration that a modern dictatorship is able to mold the public opinion of its nation so thoroughly and to suppress dissident opinion so completely that it is fatuous to expect a rift between a dictator and the people. Furthermore, the hope does not take another very ugly fact into account: the fact that in every nation there are millions of people for whom nothing succeeds like success. Even though disaffection among German masses may be wide and deep, it is not likely that the prestige of the Nazi dictatorship can be broken without a military defeat. If there had been such a possibility, it would have been realized more easily before the war than now.

More frequently the hope of a just peace by negotiation is expressed even more naively. It is simply the hope that if only the cool discussion of a conference room can be substituted for the "passions" of conflict, a just settlement is bound to be worked out. Sometimes we are told, rather piously, that what is desired is a peace of "reconciliation"; and that such a peace is quite different from one of "appeasement." But these pious words can hardly hide the ugly fact that any possible peace now would be worse than the peace of Munich. It would represent not appeasement but capitulation to a ruthless foe.

All these illusions are due to the simple moral sentimentality which does not understand that any justice which the world has ever achieved rests upon some balance between the various interests and vi-

talities which enter into a structure of justice, and that, whenever power is completely disproportionate, there injustice grows. The people who are unable to recognize this fact in the present situation are equally unable to assess the realities of a problem of justice in peace time. They do not understand why Hitler might not be made to yield now, for the same reason that they cannot understand how difficult it is to achieve justice in domestic and economic problems and how tentative and precarious every scheme of justice is.

The failure to understand the political implications of a problem of justice is not due merely to a moralist's, perhaps excusable, ignorance of the technical aspects of political life. These technical aspects are overlooked because the whole human situation is not understood. The basic error is the modern moralist's inability to appreciate the stubbornness of self-interest, particularly collective self-interest. We fail to understand Hitler, not because we are too good to gauge an egoistic mania which has broken all internal and external checks. We do not understand Hitler because we do not understand ourselves and fail to realize to what degree men achieve justice against our interests, not merely by appealing to our consciences, but by resisting our pretensions. If we understood the stubbornness of sin in all men, including ourselves, we would realize more perfectly why the collective egotism which Hitler embodies is not to be beguiled at a conference table and why Hitler would regard any effort to bring him to a conference as merely a proof of the weakness and irresolution of the foe. The conflicts of life and history happen to be more tragic than the philosophies and theologies of many of our contemporaries envisage.

There is something rather ironic in the fact that we must be on our guard, lest those who regard the peace of the Kingdom of God as a simple alternative to the difficult justice and precarious peace of the world, deliver us into a peace of slavery. They would not do it willingly; but they willingly nourish illusions which obscure the difficulties of achieving justice and the sorry realities of a peace without justice.

Christ and Caesar

Nothing is more confusing in the discussion of a Christian's duty in time of war than an ethical dualism which makes all decisions mere choices between Christ and Caesar. All unwittingly, many people seem to have been victimized by totalitarianism through their very reaction to its corruption of the concept of the State. Seeing what evils can be done in its name, they have come to regard the State itself as a suspicious character.

This is not good Christian doctrine, although undoubtedly theological support has been given to it in some Protestant communions. The Christian recognizes, to be sure, that the sovereignty of God is challenged by the temporal order and that all efforts to make perfect decisions are therefore in some degree thwarted. But this is far from saying that the State itself is an anti-Christian institution or that there is fundamental opposition between the Christian community and the State as such. The true purpose of the State, as Aristotle said, is to promote the good life. When it fails to do that it is violating its nature as a State just as the Church violates its nature when it fails to deliver an authentic Christian testimony.

For the Christian, then, there can be no such thing as a divided loyalty. If he supports the State in any enterprise he never does it merely at the State's behest but because it has the sanction of his own conscience. To oppose the State at great cost for conscience' sake is a noble act, but to suppose that some virtue inheres in mere hostility to the aims of the State is as misleading as it is sentimental. We should stoutly oppose the tendency to identify virtue with political nonconformity. That is a much too facile interpretation of Christian citizenship.

A Sermonette

Romans 2:1 "Therefore thou art inexcusable O man, whosoever thou art that judgest; for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest doest the same thing."

The most persistent note in the critical mail which reaches us is the assertion that Christians have no right to make a judgment between contending forces in history, so long as there is evil as well as good upon the side which they prefer to a more obvious evil.

It is significant that almost all these assertions violate the Pauline insight as recorded in the second chapter of the epistle to the Romans. They presume to judge British imperialism and Nazism as equally sinful from the vantage point of American guiltlessness. Or they judge all sinful realities in history from the vantage point of assumed Christian goodness. Thus they violate the New Testament admonition in the very effort to fulfill it too simply.

The fact is that neutrality in a social struggle is of itself no more Christian than a judgment or action which prefers one side to the other. The admonition, "judge not that ye be not judged," must qualify all judgments and actions, and is not a new possibility for judging and acting in the field of political morality.

Food for Europe?

HENRY P. VAN DUSEN

III.

1. *What are the facts about the food situation?*

On the Continent of Europe as a whole, there is a reduction in normal food supplies; there is no necessity for acute privation. This is not only the view of American food experts. It is the frequently reiterated declaration of the German authorities. "Europe cannot be starved. The crop of 1940-41 will provide food for the territories occupied by Germany. Not only Germany but the entire Continent possesses sufficient foodstuffs and agricultural means to guarantee the feeding of all countries under German administration. . . . Germany is in a position to guarantee the feeding of every individual on the Continent." The countries affected, if administered under a careful rationing system, are nearly self-sustaining on a minimum but adequate subsistence basis. And—a fact which I have nowhere discovered in Mr. Hoover's statements—Norway, Belgium and Holland had built up extensive reserves of essential supplies, adequate for from one to three years minimum necessities.

There will be acute shortage at certain points unless some measures are taken. No one questions that, though there have been grave exaggerations as to the dimensions and locations of the problem.¹ Such shortage as threatens the subjugated peoples, however, is not due in the first instance to dearth of imports because of the British blockade or to crop failures, but to despoilment of the conquered lands, to supplying the vast armies of occupation from the supplies of the subject peoples, to force mass dislocations of populations, and above all to wholesale expropriations of food, especially food-reserves, by the conquerors. Plentiful food to fend starvation from all populations under her control is in Germany's possession today.²

The main point is not primarily to locate blame for present problems but to point to their solution. If food shortage due to German seizures threatens their victims, it can be met in either of two ways—by importations from outside Europe through the Allied

¹ The most recent and authoritative exposition of basic facts in the feeding question is an article by Dr. Karl Brandt, "Food as a Political Instrument in Europe," *Foreign Affairs*, April, 1941. All concerned for an intelligent understanding based upon facts, should consult this article without fail. Dr. Brandt was formerly Professor of Agricultural Economics at the University of Berlin; now, Economist, Food Research Institute, Stanford University.

² For a straight-forward eye-witness account of the present situation, of the German seizures, of the attitudes of the subject peoples, and of the pros and cons of food-relief, see Lars Moen, *Under the Iron Heel*, Chapter I.

II.

To those who see little of consequence at stake for the people of the "Little Democracies" in the outcome of the European struggle or who believe that those democracies could now "negotiate" a sufferable peace with their conquerors, there is no perplexity. Suffering threatens; food would relieve it; food should be sent. But that is not the viewpoint of the Little Democracies themselves. To those who comprehend the deeper nature of the fate which threatens these peoples and who share their conviction that hope for their future lies only in Nazi defeat, there must be grave searching of heart.

On two points, these friends of the Little Democracies are in complete accord. First, they are eager to relieve human suffering wherever it exists as far as lies within their power. Second, they are determined that no action shall be taken which might weaken the gallant and precarious resistance of the only bulwark which stands between the whole of Europe and virtual enslavement. This determination is increasingly strong throughout the United States. It is stronger in Great Britain. It is strongest among the subjugated peoples themselves who know from their present sufferings, as no one else can know, what is at stake for them and their children in Allied success. It is precisely at the meeting-point of these two principles that the decisive judgment must be made. In the search for a right decision, what are the most important considerations?

blockade or through return by Germany of a portion of the stolen supplies. This leads to a second question.

2. *Would the importation of food actually help Germany?* Many of those who have given their support to the Hoover plan have done so in full confidence that its adoption would bring no assistance whatever to Germany. Yet careful reflection must lead to the realization that the British Government would not have given their reply to the plan without weighing all ascertainable facts, and that they would not repeatedly have rejected it nor would fully informed American church leaders have opposed it unless it is certain that its adoption would strengthen Germany's military designs. The fact is no food of any kind can be shipped from outside into occupied territory, no matter under what conditions or with what guarantees, without material assistance to the Axis war effort. The gravest danger is not seizure of imported relief by the conquerors, though Germany would hardly scruple here if it were in her interest. Primarily it is a matter of releasing more of the remaining supplies for the occupying forces and of relieving Germany of the necessity of returning food already stolen. And it must always be borne in mind that, in the Axis economy, food of any kind whatever is, directly or through its equivalents, immediately transmutable into the actual materials of war—glycerine, plastics, oil, etc. This is true even of milk. Every single ounce of milk which releases an ounce of German-controlled milk or its equivalent makes available to the German war-machine an additional supply of lubricating oil or glycerine or plastics.

3. *But will Germany return expropriated food?* The answer is, she has already begun to do so, in every one of the needy countries, and in steadily accelerating quantities. She has returned it not from compassion, but for the very good reason that she cannot afford to allow starvation or disease to threaten the subject peoples. The areas concerned are now principal bases for German military or industrial operations. Their populations are integral and important elements in the Nazi war machine.³ Underfed workmen cannot function with the efficiency demanded in fevered war industry. Workmen whose wives or children or cousins are starving will not work effectively whatever the compulsion. In the interests of efficiency so essential to her war-prosecution as well as to forestall the possibility of epidemic or disorder, Germany can and must see to it that minimum allowances of food are made available.

Here we meet the most bitter paradox of all. There is evidence that the present agitation, however sin-

cere and noble its intent, is actually increasing rather than relieving the distress of the subjugated populations. And in at least two particulars:

First. The most serious confiscations of food by the Germans—those which are lifting the problem from one of shortage to one of real privation—have occurred *since* Mr. Hoover started his agitation. When one recalls Hitler's usual methods in these matters, it is more than possible that these wholesale withdrawals (which must ultimately be replaced unless food is imported from overseas) have been encouraged by hope that acceptance of the Hoover scheme would effect replenishment from outside Europe.

Second. As already indicated, official German sources have repeatedly denied any food shortage *for the whole of the Continent*, and have affirmed the readiness of the German Government to assure adequate supplies for all subject populations. All too probably, the very considerable restorations of stolen food already made to Holland, Belgium, Poland and Occupied France, would have been, before this, much more considerable except for the same hope that Mr. Hoover's plan would make them unnecessary.

4. *What is the attitude of the conquered peoples themselves?* Mr. Hoover has repeatedly declared that he feels called to "raise a voice in behalf of the Little Democracies." Most Americans have assumed that he speaks at the urgent desire and with the approval of the leaders of these nations. These are not the facts. He has proposed that food be purchased by their Governments; not one of these Governments has approved this suggestion. A very considerable number of the most distinguished patriots and statesmen of the Little Democracies are at present in the United States, not in official capacities, but as private citizens. It has not been possible to discover one of them who favors the Hoover propaganda. It cannot be said that they do not represent the attitudes of their peoples. They are in intimate communication with the populace of their nations; who else is so qualified to speak for them? Privately, leading spokesmen of each of the countries concerned have expressed categorical and emphatic disapproval of the Hoover plan and of the campaign being carried on in its behalf.

How is this possible? To many good Christians, it may seem incredible that the peoples of these nations should actually oppose a scheme which has the sending of relief for their need as its purpose. Yet that is the fact. And for the reason which many Americans seem incapable of grasping—that they prefer freedom to food, that they are prepared to undergo any needful sacrifice, even risk of starvation, in order to assure freedom for their children if not for themselves, and that they are convinced

³ See recent Official German pronouncements on this point.

that Mr. Hoover's plans, with all their good intentions, would in fact lessen the possibility of the recovery of their freedom.

This whole matter is riddled with tragic paradox. But the most grotesque paradox is that many who oppose the American aid for the Allies which alone can save the Little Democracies from a fate of indefinite servitude should pose as their self-designated saviors, while those, with the full confidence and approval of the leaders of those nations, who have felt constrained to question the Hoover scheme, should be pilloried as their heartless enemies with imputations of "cruelty," "inhumanity," etc.

5. This raises a very difficult matter which one would gladly overlook. Yet it cannot be completely passed by, for it bears very directly on the issue. It is the relation of political views and activities to the problem. Mr. Hoover affirms his desire that totalitarianism should fail. Nevertheless, he has developed extensive proposals for American collaboration with a victorious Axis economy, that is with a triumphant Hitler astride the prostrate forms of the Little Democracies. All the while that he insists that he would contemplate no move which might weaken British defense, he has been meeting rather secretly in Washington with the most extreme isolationists to plan the defeat of our Government's efforts to aid the Allies including the Lease-Lend Bill. But every intelligent citizen of the Little Democracies regarded the enactment of the Lease-Lend Bill as the most important pending action toward their ultimate liberation. In these efforts as well as in his feeding plans, Mr. Hoover's closest associate has been Mr. William R. Castle, one of the most influential advocates of American appeasement of both Germany and Japan, foremost leader in the America First Movement, a man whom the democracies regard as among the most dangerous enemies in the United States of all they hold most dear.

This is not to challenge the sincerity of Mr. Hoover's political views. But with all his personal magnanimity and great services to human need, the Little Democracies can hardly be expected to trust one who is employing the full weight of his immense political influence to defeat the succor upon which their very existence hangs; nor can their friends in this country. The biblical figure is altered: men cry for freedom and are proffered bread.

Mr. Hoover makes moving appeal to the Parable of the Good Samaritan. Is it possible that he has not pressed with sufficient thoroughness the analogy of that story to the present situation?

The traveller from Jerusalem to Jericho who has fallen among thieves is a company of nations—Holland, Belgium, Norway, Denmark, Finland, Poland, Czechoslovakia, France, Great Britain. All but one has been felled and taken. The victims have not been

left, stripped of raiment, wounded and half dead, making their appeal for relief to the passer-by. The victims are still wholly within the power of their attackers, bound in utter servitude and increasingly stripped and wounded. One alone of their company continues the struggle valiantly in behalf of all. Their plea is not primarily for solace from past injuries, but for release from present and future enslavement. It is proposed to apply salve to their sores. Their cry is for the breaking of their shackles. And they are prepared to endure any immediate suffering for the sake of that emancipation. Above all they beg that aid, not impediment, be given to the comrade who alone still fights their battle.

6. We have said that the whole problem comes to focus at the meeting-point of the desire to relieve suffering and the determination not to weaken Allied defense. For all who face the issue in the perspective which for the Little Democracies themselves is axiomatic, the crucial question has been and is—is the threat of actual starvation for the subjugated peoples such as to justify a measure of assistance to their conquerors? Put conversely, is Allied resistance sufficiently secure to risk a measure of aid to the Axis in order to relieve privation? The answer to that question can be given only by the Allied Powers themselves. The leaders of the Little Democracies are in closest contact with the British Government in the matter. They have confidence in the decisions being made in London. They are satisfied with all decisions thus far taken.

IV.

One question remains on which the people of our Churches have a right to be reassured. Is everything possible being done to implement the solicitude of American Christians in this tragic situation?

It is widely supposed that Mr. Hoover and his Committee are the only persons concerning themselves with the food problem. As a matter of fact several other bodies, each enjoying the full confidence not only of the British and American Governments but of the Little Democracies themselves, have been and are actively at work to discover what if anything could be done which would not aid the conquerors and which therefore would win the approval of the Allied nations. One of these is the American Red Cross. Another is the American Friends Service Committee.

There is another which is small and entirely unofficial, but of special interest to the readers of this paper. In late September, five of the sponsors of *Christianity and Crisis*, including foremost representatives of four of our greatest communions and of the inter-church and ecumenical movements, joined in counsel as to how effective expression might be

given to the concern of American Christians who favor full aid to the Allies, yet are hopeful that acute distress may be allayed. Immediately prior to Lord Lothian's flight to England in October and at his request, they spent an evening in conference with him. Through him they communicated their views to the British Government by cable and letter while he was in London. Consultation was resumed immediately on his return; has been maintained with authorities of the American and Allied governments since. As these lines go to press, they are again in conference with Lord Halifax on this matter. They have functioned solely as an informal group of interested individuals. They launched no propaganda because they knew it would be both inappropriate and unnecessary. They issued no public announcement because they have been unwilling to arouse expectations which might not be fulfilled. But it is not improbable that acceptance by the British Government of the Red Cross proposals for Unoccupied France and Spain was due in part to their representations. Some of them had hoped that; if and as

need became acute, it might be possible to extend similar help into Occupied France, Belgium or other countries. There is no certainty that this would have been approved by the Governments concerned, but it was the one best chance. Every hope and effort in that direction are being blocked by the dogged advocacy of the Hoover scheme.

Thus Christians deeply concerned in this matter may know that their solicitude is not without continuous and effective representation. It is not yet clear whether the leaders of the subjugated democracies will regard further measures of relief as needed. It is by no means certain that the critical state of Allied defense would permit further exceptions to rigid blockade. It is certain that whatever can safely be undertaken will be approved. And it is also certain—here is the supreme tragedy—that the greatest handicap to positive action is the effort to mobilize American opinion for political pressure upon the British nation—a campaign which is unnecessary, self-defeating and deeply resented by *all* partners in the united struggle for human freedom.

The Christian and the War

THE RT. REV. E. S. WOODS, D.D.

Bishop of Lichfield

IT HAS been truly said that life is a sum of relationships, and to the Christian the two great relationships involved in Christian living are those which link him to God and to his fellow man. In these relationships war stands unmasked as a contradiction to the true interpretation and expression of the Christian's fundamental belief in the Fatherhood of God and the universal brotherhood of man.

A Christian, however, set in the midst of this evil world, where not infrequently the choice confronting him is not a plain one between right and wrong, but a complex one between a less and an even lesser good or between a greater or a lesser evil, is under a special necessity of finding a just proportion and balance in his judgments. This is particularly true in our present tragic situation. On the one hand, all the nations of Europe, and to a certain extent of the world, are involved in a common share of moral responsibility for the kind of civilization (if that word can be used!) which has led straight to the present war; and this is especially true of the course of events in Europe during the last twenty years. On the other hand, the consciousness of participation in this general moral failure ought not, so I believe, to be allowed to blunt our judgment as to the truly hideous iniquity of the system which we are now seeking forcibly to restrain and to cast down. I am for my part quite certain that for those who still

believe in and try to practice the "decencies of civilization," to stand supinely by and allow, without any attempt to stem it, the truly diabolical tyranny which goes by the name of Nazism would be in the sight of God a greater evil than war itself, even in its hideous modern expression. I find myself, therefore, in agreement with Professor Reinhold Niebuhr when he writes:

"Whatever our moral scruples may be in regard to the historic decisions of past decades which drove the Germans to this madness, if it is not possible to define the Nazi system as tyranny, it is not possible to make any valid judgments in regard to right and wrong in history at all."

For the Christian, however, to reach such a conclusion on the moral aspects of the war does not imply that his responsibility is at an end. For, if there is no other way to stem the onset of lawless aggression, if force must be used, if war there must be, then let it be war without hatred. This is where the Christian Church must act with all its influence and all its resources. We, the Church of Christ, stand for a great universal fellowship which transcends all racial and national barriers, a brotherhood stronger to unite than all other forces to divide. At all costs we, the Church, must keep this fellowship

in being. Through all the deceit and lies, through all the poisonous propaganda, through all the clamor of hate and hysteria, through all the terrible power of modern psychological mobilization—through all this we must cleave fast to the basic fact that we, English Christians, German Christians, Polish Christians, French Christians, Japanese Christians, Chinese Christians—we are all one in Christ, bound together in a glorious divine fellowship which no guns nor bombs can smash. Even in the midst of fighting we will, by God's grace, love our enemies and go on steadfastly praying for them. For—hard though it seems to believe it—the fighting will end one day, and then the re-emergence of unbroken fellowship will be of priceless value in providing the foundations of a new world of good will and lasting peace. The least that we Christians can do is to maintain this spirit of forgiveness and reconciliation and spread it abroad amongst all sections of society.

Unless a new Christian order can emerge from this fiery ordeal more gentle and humble, more genuinely set on peace, in fact more truly Christian and ready to give a Christian lead to the world, then indeed the sacrifices which await us will have been in vain. That the coming of some new and infinitely better economic and international order is in accordance with the will of God and will assuredly take place in due course, I have no shadow of doubt. We are manifestly at the end of an era in history, and a new world is struggling to come to the birth in infinite agony. But in the midst of the agony, let us never let go of our strong hope; and if, as we Christians believe, the Spirit of God is truly alive

and at work, then "the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed," a glory which will assuredly be manifested in part, at any rate, here on this earth on the stage of history.

Everyone who cherishes this hope and lives by this faith is releasing something of the life and power of the Eternal God into this needy world. In that immortal work, Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*, Christian and his companion Hopeful found themselves on one occasion taken prisoner by Giant Despair in Doubting Castle (I think a good many people, specially in these grim days, know the inside of that prison!). They lay for a while in their dungeon in a miserable plight, bruised from the Giant's beatings and fed on bread and water, and wondering if they would ever get out again. Then at midnight, after they had prayed together, "Christian," says the inimitable story, "as one half amazed, brake out in this passionate speech: 'What a fool,' quoth he, 'am I, thus to lie in a stinking Dungeon, when I may as well walk at liberty. I have a Key in my bosom called Promise, that will, I am persuaded, open any Lock in Doubting Castle.' Then said Hopeful, 'That's good news; good Brother, pluck it out of thy bosom and try.'" Without a moment's delay he tried it. They got through the dungeon door and then the door into the castle yard and finally through the iron gate ("that Lock went damnable hard"), and so back on to the King's Highway and off on their pilgrimage again. God gives that key to any and all who ask Him for it.

The World Church: News and Notes

Karl Barth Speaks to French Christians

How far Karl Barth has moved from a position which seemed to be completely indifferent to historical vicissitudes and problems may be seen from a recent communication of his to French Protestants, in which he makes the following observations on the religious and political problems of a defeated country.

"Need I remind you that a whole ocean of actual events, of enemy success and of our own failure, does not necessarily contain for us as Christians a single drop of truth? The recognition that we underestimated others and overestimated ourselves is a good and necessary thing. This recognition, however, has nothing to teach us about what is right or wrong or about the responsibility and decision which follow on our knowledge of right or wrong. I cannot think that your judgment of today about the fundamental situation between Hitler and the rest of us is different from a year ago just because in the meantime Hitler has had so many good days.

"If I have been well informed and understand the matter rightly there is much talk in Christian circles in the France of today about the humility with which one ought to acknowledge and accept 'total defeat' as a divine judgment. And further, about the penitence which is now necessary. And again, about a sorrowful silence in which one must address oneself to the modest tasks which still remain, or are beginning to emerge, under the provisional arrangements of the armistice. Much talk also about prayer, about preaching Christ crucified, about creating, preserving and encouraging a new public spirit, as the only possible way for you to cooperate today in matters which are the common concern of the Christian Church and the legal state. I understand all this, and I am doing my best to understand it with sympathy and trust. For I am a little disturbed by the fact that I seem to have heard all this before; that is to say, in the Germany after 1933, when she was overrun by National Socialism. At that time and in Germany it implied a retreat of Christianity from the responsibility in ecclesiastical and political spheres

to the inner sphere of a religious attitude which, in order to maintain itself, no longer concerned itself with, or at least was not willing to fight and suffer for, the right form of the Church, let alone that of the state. . . .

" . . . Let us only be sure that, if we preach about humility, it is a humility before God of which we are speaking, and not a humility before facts and circumstances, before powers and dominions, before men and human authorities. Humility before God can have nothing to do with resignation, nor with a stunned petrification before a destiny which we must recognize, at any rate for the time being, to be in a certain sense unalterable. If we were to give way to this, we should have surrendered our faith and the enemy would already have triumphed over us. . . ."

The Niemoeller Mystery

Authoritative information has come from Protestant leaders in Europe that the rumors about the possibility of Pastor Niemoeller's joining the Catholic Church are not without some foundation, although it is emphasized that the information is not official. It is assumed that he has actually sent a letter from his prison to the Catholic authorities without consulting with either his wife or former colleagues, and that his two years of isolation have left him without a strong sense of the consequences of such an action upon the Confessional group in Germany, whose inspiration he has been. It is thought that his disappointment over the capitulation of large sections of the Lutheran Church to the Nazi regime may have been partly responsible for prompting him to take this step. It is not believed that the reported action is as yet irrevocable.

Pagan Radio Services

Germany now has regular pagan radio services. In one of these recently the following creed was recited: "We believe in our nation and the Fuehrer, we believe

in youth, we believe in the nobility of our people; in the righteousness of our arms; in our flag; in God who stands by the brave; in Germany's greatness and eternity."

The address decried the creeds of the past and declared that no legends are required in an age of modern machines and arms. In place of the outmoded religions of the past, it presented the modern creed "which binds the heart of the German to the nation and to the Fuehrer and lays our destiny trustingly into the Fuehrer's hand. We believe in our Fuehrer and our Fuehrer believes in us. We do not, therefore, ask how long our soldiers will have to man the front lines, for we confide the decision to our Fuehrer."

Corrupted Christian Doctrine

The Rumanian Iron Guard, which avenged itself upon its enemies through a horrible blood bath, after the abdication of King Carol, now claims that the relations between comrades in the various units are so brotherly as to approach in feeling-content the Christian love of the neighbor. Codreanu has reinterpreted in nationalistic terms the vision of St. John of the end of the ages and the last judgment. He declares that "the resurrection of the nations in the name of the Saviour Jesus Christ" gives history meaning. Some of the priests of the Orthodox Church have accepted Codreanu's appropriations and corruptions of Christian ideas, but the Orthodox Church on the whole holds aloof from his movement.

Our Contributors

We have been asked to identify our authors more fully. Those who have contributed to previous issues are: Professor John C. Bennett of the Pacific School of Religion, Professor Justin Wroe Nixon of the Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, The Right Reverend Edward C. Parsons, retired Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and Lewis Mumford, author, historian, and journalist. The author of the article in the current issue is Professor Henry P. Van Dusen of Union Theological Seminary in New York City.

We are glad to announce articles by the following authors in the coming issues: Dean Lynn Harold Hough of Drew Theological Seminary, President Henry Sloane Coffin of Union Theological Seminary in New York City, Dr. Hans Simons of the New School of Social Research, President John Mackay of Princeton Theological Seminary, Denis de Rougemont, Swiss author and journalist, and John Foster Dulles, a member of the Versailles Peace Commission, who will write on the Versailles Treaty. We shall also publish an anonymous article on the situation of the Church in Holland.

CHRISTIANITY AND CRISIS

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion
601 West 120th Street New York, N. Y.

\$1.50 per year

10 cents per copy

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR
Chairman
JOHN C. BENNETT
CHARLES C. BURLINGHAM
JOHN A. MACKAY

RHODA E. MCCULLOCH
FRANCIS P. MILLER
EDWARD L. PARSONS
HENRY P. VAN DUSEN

Introductory Offer Terminates

We are glad to report that the response to our editorial venture has been remarkable and that subscriptions continue to come to us by the hundreds every week. Our introductory offer terminates with this issue. The subscription rate henceforth is \$1.50 per year in the United States and \$1.75 abroad.